

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/000732

International filing date (day/month/year)
14.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
16.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
C25D3/56, C25D3/52, G11B5/858, H01F10/14

Applicant
CANON KABUSHIKI KAISHA

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☒ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Gault, N

Telephone No. +31 70 340-1056



10/566949

IP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 03 FEB 2006
International application No.
PCT/JP2005/000732WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/000732

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	2,4,6,8-10
	No: Claims	1,3,5,7,11
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	4,6,8-10
	No: Claims	1-3,5,7,11
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-11
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VI Certain documents cited

1. Certain published documents (Rules 43bis.1 and 70.10)

and / or

2. Non-written disclosures (Rules 43bis.1 and 70.9)

see form 210

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000732

Re Item V.

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1 : PATENT ABSTRACTS OF JAPAN vol. 1998, no. 13, 30 November 1998 &; JP
10 212592 A (TANAKA KIKINZOKU KOGYO KK), 11 August 1998

D2 : CH393026 A (THE NATIONAL CASH REGISTER COMPANY) 31 May 1965

2 Prior Art

Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document): a plating solution containing ionic Fe, ionic Pt, and a complex agent, at a molar ratio of the ionic Fe to the ionic Pt ranging from 0.75 to 3 (parag. [0006] and example 2 of computer t r a n s l a t i o n a t "http://www4.ipdl.ncipi.go.jp/Tokujitu/PAJdetail.ipdl?N0000=60&N0120=01&N2001=2&N3001=H10-212592"). A process for providing such a structure and the apparatus involved in the process are also disclosed.

Document D2 discloses a plating solution containing ionic Fe, ionic Ni and Molybdenum compound, whereby Molybdenum is described as complexing agent for the iron.

3 Novelty (Article 33(2) PCT)

As can be seen from the above, document D1 discloses in combination all the features defined in independent claim 1, 7 and 11 and dependent claims 3 and 5. Hence the subject-matter of these claims is not new (Article 33(2) PCT).

4 Inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT)

Dependent claims 2 does not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which it refers, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

However, bearing the comments made in Item VIII, the combination of the features of dependent claims 4, 6, 8-10 are neither known from, nor rendered obvious by, the available prior art. The reasons are as follows: D1 does not disclose nor teach the use of a lower pH, additional copper element in the alloy, or specific heat-treatment as after-treatment.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000732

Re Item VI

Certain published documents

Application No Patent No	Publication date (day/month/year)	Filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (valid claim) (day/month/year)
JP2004323948	18/11/04	28/04/03	-

Re Item VIII.

The application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because claim 1 is not clear.

It is clear from the description on page 12 lines 24-26 and from the exemplified solutions B and C as well as solutions A2 to H2 and A3 to H3 of example 1 that the pH feature is also essential to the definition of the invention: hence these solutions which fulfill the requirement of the molar ratio have a pH outside the pH range specified in dependent claim 4 and are given as unstable.

Since independent claim 1 does not contain this feature it does not meet the requirement following from Article 6 PCT taken in combination with Rule 6.3(b) PCT that any independent claim must contain all the technical features essential to the definition of the invention.